

**From:** [michael.k.sams@uscg.mil](mailto:michael.k.sams@uscg.mil)  
**To:** [Mason, Steve](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [Non-DoD Source] FW: FEMA CG EPLO  
**Date:** Monday, September 04, 2017 10:42:41 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Thx, Steve!

Given that this is an "agreement" between FEMA & EPA, is this another reason why the CG might rethink our future pursuit of our own MA? Are we more "covered" or considered "incorporated" when operating under an EPA MA - as the deputy while EPA is the primary agency?

If we're going to pursue our own down the road maybe we should enter into our own agreement/understanding with FEMA.

Deep thoughts...

V/r,  
Mike Sams  
CGD 8  
504-671-2234 (o)  
281-881-6193 (c)  
Sent with BlackBerry Work  
(www.blackberry.com)

---

**From:** Mason, Steve <[mason.steve@epa.gov](mailto:mason.steve@epa.gov)>  
**Date:** Monday, Sep 04, 2017, 7:44 PM  
**To:** Sams, Michael K CIV <[Michael.K.Sams@uscg.mil](mailto:Michael.K.Sams@uscg.mil)>, Martin, Tom (H) <[tmcjmartin@gmail.com](mailto:tmcjmartin@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] FW: FEMA CG EPLO

**With Regards, Steve**



---

**From:** Mason, Steve  
**Sent:** Monday, September 04, 2017 6:20 PM  
**To:** 'FEMA-R6-ROC-USCG'  
**Subject:** RE: FEMA CG EPLO

**With Regards, Steve**



---

**From:** FEMA-R6-ROC-USCG [<mailto:r06-roc-uscg@fema.dhs.gov>]

**Sent:** Monday, September 04, 2017 6:02 PM

**To:** Mason, Steve <[mason.steve@epa.gov](mailto:mason.steve@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** FEMA CG EPLO